

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-22 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-22 stand rejected. Claims 1, 2, and 15 are amended. Support for the amendments to claims 1, 2, and 15 can be found in the originally filed specification at paragraph [0003]. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

## **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-14, 15-18, and 21-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Beyda et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,487,277) in view of Rigsby et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,556,971). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The teachings of Beyda et al. are generally directed toward user interfaces of integrated voice response systems. In particular, the Examiner relies on Beyda et al. to teach that a user of an automated telephone call handling system is allowed to navigate to a location in a hierarchical prompt menu, choose to save that location, and at the start of a next call, be presented with an option to execute the function at that location instead of navigating through the hierarchical prompt menu. However, Beyda et al. do not teach, suggest, or motivate, a voice binding system that, upon manual identification of a path sequence by a user, makes a determination whether a first utterance already exists in association with the patch sequence and, conditioned on results of the determination, either plays the first utterance for the user if it already exists, or, if it does not yet exist, prompts the user to provide the first utterance for association with the path sequence.

The teachings of Rigsby et al. are generally directed toward computer implemented speech recognition system training. In particular, the Examiner relies on Rigsby et al. to teach obtaining a user utterance, storing it as a model in a user-built lexicon, and associating the utterance with a function. However, Rigsby et al. do not teach, suggest, or motivate a voice binding system that, upon manual identification of a path sequence by a user, makes a determination whether a first utterance already exists in association with the patch sequence and, conditioned on results of the determination, either plays the first utterance for the user if it already exists, or, if it does not yet exist, prompts the user to provide the first utterance for association with the path sequence.

Applicant's claimed invention is directed toward a voice binding system that, upon manual identification of a path sequence by a user, makes a determination whether a first utterance already exists in association with the patch sequence and, conditioned on results of the determination, either plays the first utterance for the user if it already exists, or, if it does not yet exist, prompts the user to provide the first utterance for association with the path sequence. For example, independent claim 15, especially as amended, recites, "a voice binding system that, upon manual identification of a path sequence by a user, makes a determination whether a first utterance already exists in association with the patch sequence and, conditioned on results of the determination, either plays the first utterance for the user if it already exists, or, if it does not yet exist, prompts the user to provide the first utterance for association with the path sequence." Independent claims 1 and 2, especially as amended, recite similar subject matter. Support for the amendments can be found in the originally filed specification at

paragraph [0029]. Therefore, Beyda et al. and Rigsby et al. do not teach, suggest, or motivate all of the limitations of the independent claims. These differences are significant.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 2, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), along with rejection on these grounds of all claims dependent therefrom.

Claims 10-14 and 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beyda et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,487,277) in view of Rigsby et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,556,971) and De Armas et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,873,064). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

For discussion of significant differences between Applicant's claimed invention and the teachings of Beyda et al. and Rigsby et al., Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner's attention to remarks detailed above with respect to rejection of independent claims 1, 2, and 15.

The teachings of De Armas et al. are generally directed toward a multi-action voice macro method. In particular, the Examiner relies on De Armas et al. to teach matching a phrase decoded from a user utterance to a vocabulary phrase of a sub-context tree generated by automated analysis of a menu structure. However, De Armas et al. do not teach, suggest, or motivate a voice binding system that, upon manual identification of a path sequence by a user, makes a determination whether a first utterance already exists in association with the patch sequence and, conditioned on results of the determination, either plays the first utterance for the user if it already

exists, or, if it does not yet exist, prompts the user to provide the first utterance for association with the path sequence.

Applicant's claimed invention is directed toward a voice binding system that, upon manual identification of a path sequence by a user, makes a determination whether a first utterance already exists in association with the patch sequence and, conditioned on results of the determination, either plays the first utterance for the user if it already exists, or, if it does not yet exist, prompts the user to provide the first utterance for association with the path sequence. For example, independent claim 15, especially as amended, recites, "a voice binding system that, upon manual identification of a path sequence by a user, makes a determination whether a first utterance already exists in association with the patch sequence and, conditioned on results of the determination, either plays the first utterance for the user if it already exists, or, if it does not yet exist, prompts the user to provide the first utterance for association with the path sequence." Independent claim 2, especially as amended, recites similar subject matter. Support for the amendments can be found in the originally filed specification at paragraph [0029]. Therefore, Beyda et al., Rigsby et al., and De Armas et al. do not teach, suggest, or motivate all of the limitations of the independent claims. These differences are significant.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 10-14 and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of their dependence from allowable base claims.

**CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Aug 25, 2006

By: Gregory Stobbs  
Gregory A. Stobbs  
Reg. No. 28,764

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600